



University of  
Texas Libraries

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

the **KREMLIN  
SPEAKS**

*excerpts from statements  
made by the Leaders of  
the Soviet Union*

Add-pg 88



*excerpts from statements made by  
the Leaders of the Soviet Union*

*the*  
**KREMLIN  
SPEAKS**

. . . ON WORLD AIMS page 3

. . . ON SOVIET PLANS page 7

. . . ON SOVIET TECHNIQUES  
page 11

. . . ON SOVIET ETHICS page 16

. . . ON INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM page 18

. . . ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION page 30





DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 4264

EUROPEAN AND BRITISH COMMONWEALTH SERIES 25

RELEASED OCTOBER 1951

DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS, OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government  
Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Price 15 cents

# the KREMLIN SPEAKS

WITH the end of hostilities in 1945 the thin veneer of wartime cooperation between the Soviet Union and its allies melted swiftly away. To the American people the realization that the leaders of the Soviet Union had not given up their original purpose of communizing and dominating the world came slowly—and it came as a shock.

Here was the government of a nation that had pledged itself to support the principles and programs of the United Nations. Instead of building for peace and cooperation, its leaders began to follow, more and more boldly, what has since emerged as one of the narrowest and most blatantly aggressive policies in modern history. They have used their membership in the United Nations to obstruct and subvert the purposes of the United Nations. They have preached division and hatred. They have exploited the hungry and the homeless. They have “liberated” countries by turning them into Soviet-run police states. They have preyed on the loyalties of free men, inciting the citizens of friendly powers to treason. They have cut off their own people by an Iron Curtain. They have carried their aggressions to the threshold of World War III.

What manner of men are these? For whom do they speak?

They speak certainly for the Communist Party in the Soviet Union. In numbers that Party is a small fraction of the population of the Soviet Union. In terms of authority, it is the Government of the U.S.S.R. It holds an unchecked power over every phase of Soviet life including the press, arts and science,



agriculture, industry, trade, transport, travel, and recreation. Through its secret police and its control over every avenue of personal advancement, it enforces an iron discipline on Party members and nonmembers alike. Any major deviation from the Party line in act or expressed opinion is punished severely. In fact, to be charged in the Soviet Union as a "deviationist" is practically equivalent to being charged with treason.

That these men of the Kremlin, these top members of the Communist Party in the U.S.S.R., speak for the mass of the Soviet peoples is extremely doubtful. Their attitude is at direct variance with our experiences during World War II, when we had some opportunities to meet with the courageous and likable peoples of the Soviet Union. We found them eager to know the outside world and willing to work with us. It is a reasonable assumption that these fundamental attitudes persist, although the Kremlin has taken extreme measures to disrupt foreign contact with the Soviet population. The ordinary Soviet citizen is not allowed to visit our country, and strict laws as well as the ever-present secret police virtually prohibit his contact with the few Americans who are permitted to enter the Soviet Union. In the meantime, his Government is doing its best to turn him against us. It is carrying out a massive national campaign of slander against the American Government and the American people—a campaign that has become progressively more violent since the end of World War II. Obviously, the Kremlin is encountering appreciable nonacceptance for its campaign of hate.

The men of the Kremlin are power-hungry men who use doctrine and language as means to an end. They are skillful. They speak from many positions and in divers tongues. It is not always easy to find the true meaning behind what they say, for they make use of the peaceful man's desire for friendly and sensible solutions. We need to know more about their thinking. When they borrow the language of the free world, we need to watch their acts as well as their words.

A widespread understanding of the Soviet Union's techniques of "confuse and control," of "zigzag and retreat," of "the big lie" can bring a powerful and continuing support for the policies which the free nations must follow in order to maintain the peace and

avoid war. This pamphlet is published as one aid toward furthering such an understanding among the people of the United States.

Gathered here are statements made by the leaders of the Kremlin, excerpts from their laws and their use of Communist doctrine, quotations from their official newspapers and magazines. Taken together, they add up to a total that should be kept in mind by men everywhere when the Kremlin speaks.

## . . . ON WORLD AIMS

FROM the days of Lenin, and continuing through the regime of Joseph Stalin, the leaders of the Soviet Union have pursued their aim of dominating the world through communism. Upon occasion they have found it expedient to "cooperate" with other groups and other movements, but their will to world domination has been constant throughout the abrupt changes in Soviet foreign policy.

There are few Americans today who are unaware that they and their nation are among the prime targets of Soviet communism. What some may not grasp clearly is the Soviet Union's indirect attack upon their security.

By whittling down the area of the free world by aggression, subversion, and wars-by-satellite, the men of the Soviet Union are attempting to acquire, bit by bit, the control of world power. Their aim is to build up a real and potential military strength greater than any force that could be brought against them. According to their announced intentions, they would then use that strength to establish a political and economic dictatorship throughout the world.

Fortunately for the free peoples, there is still time to act. A coordinated defense can take the profit out of Soviet aggressions. Backed up by an understanding of Soviet tactics, it can create the situations of strength that will help deter the Soviet Union from gambling on a general war. But if piecemeal attacks by the Soviets go unchecked, if each contrived "incident" is not dealt with firmly, the surviving democratic nations could one day find themselves isolated and easy victims in a Communist-dominated world.



As early as 1919 Lenin declared that war with the "bourgeois" states was "inevitable" and that the Soviets must undertake the necessary military preparations. Lenin said:

We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable. That means that if the ruling class, the proletariat, wants to hold sway, it must prove its capacity to do so by its military organization.

—LENIN, "Report of Central Committee at 8th Party Congress" (1919).

Two years later, Stalin provided this prophetic description of communism's role in international affairs:

The tasks of the Party in foreign policy are: 1) to utilize each and every contradiction and conflict among the surrounding capitalist groups and governments for the purpose of disintegrating imperialism; 2) to spare no pains or means to render assistance to the proletarian revolutions in the West; 3) to take all necessary measures to strengthen the national liberation movement in the East; 4) to strengthen the Red Army.

—STALIN, "Party After Seizure of Power," *Pravda*, August 28, 1921.

This was blunt language, remarkable for its candor. Even in those early years the more characteristic form of Communist expression was a bombastic jargon deliberately contrived to confuse the peoples of all countries—including their own—in order to conceal the real purposes of their program. This is Stalin speaking in 1922:

Since the time the Soviet republics were formed, the states of the world have split into two camps: the camp of socialism and the camp of capitalism. In the camp of capitalism we

have imperialists, war, national enmity, oppression, colonial slavery, and supernationalism. In the camp of the Soviets, the camp of socialism, on the contrary, we have mutual confidence, national equality, and the peaceful co-existence and fraternal collaboration of people.

—STALIN, *Pravda*, December 10, 1922.

Thus the Soviets artificially and dogmatically divided the world into two irreconcilable parts, the Communist and the non-Communist, and proceeded to propagandize their theory that the two parts were locked in a death struggle. Stalin's opportunity for a more active role in the "struggle" came in 1924 with the death of Lenin. Under his leadership, the campaign for the world-wide spread of communism was intensified:

Comrade Stalin took a leading part in the working out of the program of the Communist International. There is not a single important decision of the Communist International, not a forecast which is not permeated with Stalin's farsightedness, his ability to map out a crushing blow at the enemy.

—*Outline History of the Communist International* (Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers, Moscow, 1934).

The Soviet masters planned their campaign step by step. Stalin, in 1925, listed these aims for Communists working in various parts of the world:

The immediate tasks confronting the revolutionary movement in capitalistically developed colonial and dependent countries are as follows: 1) to win over the best elements of the working class to the side of Communism and to form independent Communist Parties; 2) to set up a national revolutionary bloc of workers, peasants, and revolutionary intelligentsia, as against the bloc of compromising national bourgeoisie and the imperialists; 3) to guarantee the hegemony of the proletariat in this bloc; 4) to fight for the liberation of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie from the influence of the compromising national bourgeoisie; 5) to secure the link-



ing of the national liberation movement with the proletarian movement of the advanced countries.

—STALIN, "Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East," 1925 (*Leninism*, Co-operative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers, Moscow, 1934, vol. I, pp. 194-195).

Twenty-two years later, the Kremlin's doctrine of a divided world had become the keynote of its propaganda to further the split between the Soviet and non-Soviet spheres.

The Soviet daily, *Trud*, explained the world situation with the usual twisted facts. One could no longer know the real truth from Soviet jargon, for black had become white and white had become black. Democratic terms and ideas had been distorted to fit Soviet purposes:

There now exist two diametrically opposed political lines. One, directed to bring down imperialism and strengthen democracy, is followed by the U.S.S.R. The other, which is the policy of the U.S.A. and Britain, is directed to strengthening imperialism and stifling democracy.

—*Trud* (Labor), October 16, 1947.

With the contrast drawn so neatly, and in the terms of historic doctrine, the next step is obvious. In the name of "internationalism," the leaders of the Communist Party in Russia, the men of the Kremlin, are calling upon national Communist Parties and "honest men everywhere" to subordinate all their loyalties and interests to the "defense" of the U.S.S.R. The following definition of the "real" internationalist was published in 1948:

At present the only determining criterion of revolutionary proletarian internationalism is: are you for or against the U.S.S.R., the motherland of the world proletariat? An internationalist is not one who verbally recognizes international solidarity or sympathizes with it. A real internationalist is one who brings his sympathy and recognition up to the point of practical and maximal help to the U.S.S.R. in support and

defense of the U.S.S.R. by every means and in every possible form. Actual cooperation with the U.S.S.R., the readiness of the workers of any country to subject all their aims to the basic problem of strengthening the U.S.S.R. in their struggle—this is the manifestation of revolutionary proletarian internationalism on the part of workmen in foreign countries. . . . The defense of the U.S.S.R., as of the socialist motherland of the world proletariat, is the holy duty of every honest man everywhere and not only of the citizens of the U.S.S.R.

—P. E. Vyshinsky, "Communism and the Motherland," *Voprosi Filosofii* (Problems of Philosophy), No. 2, 1948.

## . . . ON SOVIET PLANS

THE Communist leaders have said, "Wars for the emancipation of the world from capitalism will necessarily and inevitably arise." In anticipation of these conflicts, the Soviet masters claim "all necessary political, economic, and military preparations" are being made.

Politically, the Soviet authorities plan the "consolidation" of small nations into one superstate. Stalin, back in 1922, blamed capitalism for the "disintegration" of the free nations in the West. This is how he expressed the contrast between the two processes:

In the West, in the world of bourgeois democracy, we are witnessing the gradual decline and disintegration of the multi-national states into their component parts . . . whereas, here, in our federation, embracing no less than 30 nationalities, we are, on the contrary, witnessing a process of consolidation of political ties between the independent republics, a process which is leading to an even closer union of independent nationalities into a single independent state. Here you have two types of political union, of which one type, the capitalist type, leads to the disintegration of the state into its component parts, while the second type, the Soviet type, on the contrary, leads to a gradual but stable amalgamation



of formerly independent nationalities into a single independent state.

—STALIN in "The Amalgamation of Soviet Republics," December 26, 1922 (*Marxism and the National and Colonial Questions*, International Publishers, New York, 1942, p. 124).

Even after the many nationalities of the Czarist Empire had been "amalgamated" into one monolithic state, Stalin still dogmatically maintained that Russia was in mortal danger of attack from the outside world:

It should not be forgotten that for the time being the revolution has been victorious only in one country. It should not be forgotten that as long as capitalist encirclement exists, so long will the danger of intervention, with all the resultant consequences, exist.

—STALIN, *Problems of Leninism*, 1926.

His fears had not subsided in 1930, when he wrote:

Our capitalist encirclement is not simply a geographical conception. Our capitalist encirclement means that around the U.S.S.R. there are hostile class forces, ready to support our class enemies within the U.S.S.R. morally, materially, by means of financial blockade, and, when the opportunity offers, by means of military intervention. . . . The imperialist world is not interested in having the U.S.S.R. stand on its own legs and develop the ability to overtake and surpass the foremost capitalist countries. Hence the aid it grants to the forces of the old world in the U.S.S.R.

—STALIN, June 27, 1930 (*Leninism*, Moscow, 1933, vol. II, pp. 294–295).

Eight years later, shortly before the outbreak of World War II, Stalin once again proclaimed to the Soviet people:

Only blockheads or masked enemies . . . can deny the danger of military intervention and of attempts at restora-

tion as long as the capitalist encirclement exists. . . . The political assistance of the working class in the bourgeois countries for the working class of our country must be organized.

—STALIN, *Bolshevik*, February 1938.

The bogeyman of foreign intervention has persisted into the post-war era. It is trotted out periodically, as though to remind the Soviet people that they cannot consider themselves safe from foreign aggression until the entire world has become Communist:

But the Soviet Union, building Communism in conditions of capitalist encirclement, is not guaranteed against the danger of attack from the outside and against attempts to restore capitalism. . . . The war [of 1941–45] ended with the completed defeat of Hitler Germany. But so long as the capitalist world exists, the possibility of a new war and of bandit attacks on the U.S.S.R. are not excluded.

—*Krasny Flot* (Red Fleet), July 18, 1946.

In describing the inevitability of an "imperialist attack" on the U.S.S.R., the Kremlin leaders speak of "revolutionary war" and "revolutionary peace" in the same breath. A revolutionary war is a war *they* fight; a revolutionary peace is a peace they impose on others. When the free world arms to defend itself against aggression, it is warmongering; when the Soviets keep themselves armed to the teeth, they guilelessly insist that this is in the interest of peace.

The proletariat in the Soviet Union harbours no illusions as to the possibility of a durable peace with the imperialists. The proletariat knows that the imperialist attack against the Soviet Union is inevitable; that in the process of a proletarian world revolution wars between proletarian and bourgeois states, wars for the emancipation of the world from capitalism, will necessarily and inevitably arise. Therefore, the primary duty of the proletariat, as the fighter for socialism, is to make all the necessary political, economic and military preparations for these wars, to strengthen its Red Army—that mighty weapon of the proletariat—and to train



the masses of the toilers in the art of war. There is a glaring contradiction between the imperialists' policy of piling up armaments and their hypocritical talk about peace. There is no such contradiction, however, between the Soviet government's preparations for defense and for revolutionary war and a consistent peace policy. Revolutionary war of the proletarian dictatorship is but a continuation of revolutionary peace policy "by other means".

—"Theses of the VI World Congress of the Communist International" 1928, *International Press Correspondence*, November 28, 1928, p. 1590.

While the "imperialist attack against the Soviet Union is inevitable," it is to the Soviets' advantage to stave it off until the proper moment:

We cannot forget the saying of Lenin to the effect that a great deal in the matter of our construction depends on whether we succeed in delaying war with the capitalist countries, which is inevitable but which may be delayed either until proletarian revolution ripens in Europe or until colonial revolutions come to a head, or, finally, until the capitalists fight among themselves over the division of the colonies. Therefore, the maintenance of peaceful relations with capitalist countries is an obligatory task for us. The basis of our relations with capitalist countries consist in admitting the co-existence of two opposed systems.

—STALIN, Speech to the 15th Congress of the Soviet Union, December 2, 1927 (Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1949).

The U.S.S.R., it is true, cooperated with the "capitalist" nations against Nazi Germany after the German attack on Russia, but the Kremlin admitted this was only a temporary measure. At the end of World War II a Soviet spokesman said:

The fact that the Soviet Union and the greatly shaken capitalist countries showed themselves to be in one powerful camp, ranged against the fascist aggressors, showed that the

struggle of two systems within the democratic camp was temporarily alleviated, suspended, but this of course does not mean the end of this struggle.

—VARGA, *World Economy and World Politics*, June 1949, p. 11.

After World War II, most nations disarmed as a measure of peace. Stalin, however, urged the perpetuation of the "defense potential" of the U.S.S.R. since, according to the following statement, other countries already were "hatching the plans of a new war":

While expanding peaceful socialist construction, we must not forget for a minute the intrigues of the international reaction, which is hatching the plans of a new war. It is necessary to bear in mind the instructions of the great Lenin that, having passed to peaceful labor, it is necessary to continue being on the alert, and guard like the apple of one's eye the armed forces and the defense potential of our country.

—STALIN, Order No. 7, May 1, 1946, as Minister of Armed Forces, *Izvestia* and *Pravda*, May 1, 1946.

## . . . ON SOVIET TECHNIQUES

THE Soviets' methods of gaining control over whole countries, as well as of winning individual converts to the Communist cause, vary in accordance with local conditions. They select the bait most likely to attract the fish.

In countries with a large poverty-stricken farm population such as the Philippines, for instance, the lure is redistribution of agricultural land so that each tenant will have his own soil to till, plus communally owned farm machinery to increase the output of the land. Communist land reform does not benefit the farmers, however; those who swallow this bait discover that redistribution is followed by collectivization under rigid State control—and that their share of what they produce is smaller than ever.

In highly industrialized lands like our own, Soviet pressure is apt to be applied to labor. Latent discontent with pay or working



conditions is sought out and brought to the surface; if none exists, the seeds of discontent are planted. Just as they use satellite armies to fight their military battles, the Soviet leaders use factional strife in distant lands to bring about the economic chaos they desire. A crippling strike called at a strategic moment could be as effective as a mass air raid in destroying our industries.

Where political life is disrupted, as in Italy at the time of the 1948 elections, the Kremlin orders its hirelings to enter the arena in open competition with other political parties. (This method proved a failure in the case of Italian elections.)

Lenin, in the early days of the Soviet regime, advised his followers to resort to the infiltration of any democratic institutions which could help the Party come to power:

As long as you are unable to disperse the bourgeois parliament and every other type of reactionary institution, you *must* work inside them. . . . Participation in a bourgeois-democratic parliament . . . not only does no harm to the revolutionary proletariat, but actually makes it easier for it to *prove* to the backward masses why such parliaments deserve to be dispersed; it *facilitates* the success in dispersing them, and *facilitates* the process whereby bourgeois parliamentarism becomes "politically obsolete."

Labor organizations, as well as political institutions, must be subverted, he continued.

We must . . . resort to all sorts of stratagems, manoeuvres, illegal methods, evasions and subterfuges, only so as to get into the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work within them at all costs.

—LENIN, "Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder," 1920 (*Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1943, vol. X, pp. 95–96, 100, 101).

It is significant that Lenin's precepts on Communist techniques are usually couched in military phraseology:

To tie one's hands beforehand, openly to tell the enemy, who is at present better armed than we are, whether and

when we will fight him, is stupidity and not revolutionariness. To accept battle at a time when it is obviously advantageous to the enemy and not to us is a crime: and those political leaders of the revolutionary class who are unable to "tack, to manoeuvre, to compromise" in order to avoid an obviously disadvantageous battle, are good for nothing.

—*Ibid.*, pp. 118–119.

Timing, flexibility, and deception: these are of the essence of Soviet tactics. *Bolshevik*, in 1948, published an historical account of Soviet combat methods—ideological as well as military—which throws interesting light on some of the techniques the Soviets have used in recent years.

The defense tactics, from the point of view of the Bolsheviks, are a means for preserving the cadres and building up strength in anticipation of coming battles. The party avoided a decisive encounter whenever it was not yet ready for combat. But the Bolshevik Party never overlooked a single advantageous opportunity to engage the enemy in combat when it was to the enemy's disadvantage. It kept the enemy constantly tense; it disorganized and demoralized his forces, and at the same time it tempered and increased its own forces in daily battles with the enemy. Comrade Stalin called these the tactics of active defense. . . . The Bolshevik Party sought to occupy positions of all combat sectors and to put into combat readiness all types of armaments, for it is impossible to know beforehand what means of combat will prove to be the most advantageous for achieving a given end. Lenin remarked that the revolutionary class must first master all methods of combat without any exception whatsoever, and, second, must be ready for the most rapid and least expected substitution of one combat method for another. This also constitutes the chief rule of tactical leadership.

—BURDZHALOV, "International Significance of Historical Experience of Bolshevik Party," *Bolshevik*, September 15, 1948.



This realization of the need for quick shifting of tactics at any given moment was shared by Kremlin leaders two decades later. *Pravda*, at the close of World War II, crusaded for an "active and unceasing" attack on the "enemies of communism":

There can be no breathing space in ideological warfare. On the ideological front, we must and we shall fight not by passive resistance but by an active and unceasing attack on our enemies. This is what the Party of Lenin and Stalin teaches. This is in accordance with our traditions. . . . Let the enemy consider us nasty people. From the mouth of the enemy this is praise.

—K. SIMONOV, "Drama, Theater and Life," *Pravda*, November 22, 1946.

Abruptly all this changed. A few years later the Soviet leaders began to claim that all they wanted was peace, and that *only* they wanted peace. "Peace congresses" were held; "peace pledges" were circulated; the nations of the free world were vilified as warmongers. Despite the open record of Soviet aggression, the objective of the Soviet Union's foreign policy is now alleged to be that of preserving the peace:

There is not nor can there be any grounds for propaganda for war in the Soviet State which, from the very first day of its origin, has been firmly and consistently fighting for peace. . . . No one in the Soviet Union calls for war. . . . The peoples know that in their struggle for peace they can safely rely upon the Soviet Union. . . . "As to the Soviet Union," declared J. V. Stalin, "it will continue unswervingly to pursue its policy of preventing war and preserving peace."

—"Objective of Soviet Union's Foreign Policy," *U.S.S.R. Information Bulletin*, Washington, April 6, 1951, p. 203.

A technique which has long served the purposes of international communism is the united front. Stalin described the ultimate goal of the united front this way:

The draft [of the Comintern] attaches prime importance to the consolidation of the Communist Parties both in the West

and in the East as a primary condition for securing the hegemony of the proletariat and subsequently the dictatorship of the proletariat.

—STALIN, July 13, 1928 (*Leninism*, Moscow, 1933, vol. II, p. 44).

In the view of the now disbanded Comintern:

United front tactics, the chief object of which in the opinion of the Comintern, is the establishment of the unity of all workers in their struggle against capitalism, the unity of their militant action, are the tactics of irreconcilable struggle against the main obstacle in that struggle, viz, Social Democracy. In adopting these tactics the Communists reserve to themselves the unlimited right to expose the Social Democrats even at the time of joint action; and they carry out these tactics primarily in the form of a united front from below.

—*Outline History of Communist International* (Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers, Moscow, 1934, p. 24).

Premier Stalin in 1927 told a group of labor leaders from America:

What would happen if the Communist Party of the U.S. would appeal for aid to the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.? I think the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. would render whatever assistance it could. Indeed, what would be the worth of the Communist Party, a party that is in power, if it refused to do what it could to aid the Communist Party of another country laboring under the yoke of capitalism? I would say that such a Communist Party would not be worth a cent.

—STALIN, "Interview With American Labor Delegation," September 9, 1927 (*Leninism*, Moscow, 1934, vol. I, p. 385).

In 1943 the Soviet leaders, following a suggestion by President Roosevelt, dissolved the Communist International—at least officially—as a conciliatory gesture toward the Allies. They hoped thus to obtain more of the aid they needed so desperately in their



struggle with Germany. But after the close of World War II, the Soviets renewed their program involving "zigzags" and "retreats." In 1947 they organized a new agency, the Communist Information Bureau, for the promotion of world communism. Nine national Communist parties nominally took part in the organization of the Cominform, but its voice is the voice of Moscow. Its immediate purpose was to create a united front to block reconstruction efforts of the free world, notably the Marshall Plan for "the enthrallment of Europe." Here is an excerpt from the Cominform Declaration made late in September 1947:

In view of the fact that the majority of the leaders of the Socialist Parties (especially the British Labourites and the French Socialists) are acting as agents of United States imperialist circles, there has devolved upon the Communists the special historical task of leading the resistance to the American plan for the enthrallment of Europe, and of boldly denouncing all coadjutors of American imperialism in their own countries. At the same time, Communists must support all the really patriotic elements who do not want their countries to be imposed upon, who want to resist enthrallment of their countries to foreign capital, and to uphold their national sovereignty. The Communists must be the leaders in enlisting all anti-fascist and freedom-loving elements in the struggle against the new American expansionist plans for the enslavement of Europe.

—*Pravda*, October 22, 1947.

### . . . ON SOVIET ETHICS

TIME and time again, the Soviet leaders have asserted that their regime is not and will not be bound by the rules which "capitalist" nations observe. The only morality which Communists accept is that which helps them attain their aims. For them, the end justifies any means.

Lenin set the pattern for Communist procedures when he advocated "zigzags" and "retreats" as part of standard Soviet strategy. Soviet leaders continue to follow this pattern:

The strictest loyalty to the ideas of Communism must be combined with the ability to make all the necessary compromises, to "tack," to make agreements, zigzags, retreats, and so on, in order to accelerate the coming into power of the Communists.

—LENIN, *Selected Works* (New York, 1943, vol. X, p. 138).

The Soviet leaders shape their concept of ethics and morals to fit their ambitions. It is a simple code, uncluttered with troublesome rules about the good of the individual or the benefit of mankind.

Morals or ethics is the body of norms and rules on the conduct of Soviet peoples. At the root of Communist morality, said Lenin, lies the struggle for the consolidation and the completion of Communism. Therefore, from the point of view of Communist morality, only those acts are moral which contribute to the building up of a new Communist society.

—Radio Moscow, August 20, 1950.

Stalin added to Lenin's prescription for the "building up of a new Communist society" by preaching hate. In 1946 he said: Soviet patriotism is indissolubly connected with hatred toward the enemies of the Socialist Fatherland. "It is impossible to conquer an enemy without having learned to hate him with all the might of one's soul."

—STALIN, *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union* (Moscow, 1946, p. 55).

Hatred, violence, social turmoil—these are inseparable parts of the Soviet ideology. When from time to time it serves the purpose of the powers in the Kremlin to preach world peace and brotherhood, we would do well to remember statements like this:

Lenin-Stalin ideology [must instill] a hatred for the capitalist order, and the lying, hypocritical bourgeois ideology, whose purport is to deceive the masses. . . . We should not for a minute forget that the field of culture and ideology is a



field of violent and stubborn struggle. By its very character, socialist ideology and the culture of the Soviet people is opposed to bourgeois culture and must wage a struggle against it.

—"Lenin and Stalin on Party Ideology,"  
*Partiinaya Zhizn* (Party Life), No. 1, 1947,  
pp. 11, 19, 20.

Consider this commentary on the ethical standards of the free world:

Hatred fosters vigilance and an uncompromising attitude toward the enemy and leads to the destruction of everything that prevents Soviet peoples from building a happy life. The teaching of hatred for the enemies of the toilers enriches the conception of Socialist humanism by distinguishing it from sugary and hypocritical "philanthropy."

—*Small Soviet Encyclopedia* (Moscow, 1947,  
vol. XI, p. 1045).

Typical of the turn-about technique of Soviet leaders is this attack, a few years later, charging other nations with propagating "man-hating" ideas:

Why is it that in any state, any person instigating the murder of another person is most strictly punished under the penalty of law while a warmonger urging an attack on other countries and the extermination of whole nations is given the full opportunity to express and propagate his man-hating ideas in the press?

—Deputy N. TIKHONOV, March 1951  
Session of the Supreme Soviet of the  
U.S.S.R., *U.S.S.R. Information Bulletin*,  
Washington, April 6, 1951, p. 198.

### . . . ON INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

THE millions of people behind the Kremlin's Iron Curtain face restrictions in all aspects of their daily lives—in activities which people in the free world regard as their own private affairs.

Propaganda issued by the Kremlin proclaims that communism is dedicated to the interests of the masses. But the Kremlin's picture of Soviet life is distorted. In Soviet states, there are restrictions on religion; free press and free speech are unknown; severe controls are imposed upon labor; freedom of movement is highly circumscribed. So little news and information about the outside world filters through the Iron Curtain that the peoples under the domination of the Kremlin leaders have little or no opportunity to compare their own standards of living and civil liberties with those of the free nations.

### RELIGION

NEARLY a half century ago, Lenin borrowed a slogan which was to become the Communist foundation for discouraging religion. "Religion," he told the Russian people in 1905, "is the opium of the people." According to Kremlin propaganda, religion is based on "medieval prejudices and superstitions."

Complete freedom of conscience, the Soviet constitution reads, exists in the Communist state, but the Communists actually discourage religious observances. Most of the churches in Soviet territory have been destroyed or converted into Communist clubs, and those religions which survive are rigidly controlled by the masters in the Kremlin.

Lenin expressed this opinion of religion:

Religion is a kind of spiritual gin in which the slaves of capital drown their human shape and their claims to any decent human life.

—LENIN, *Selected Works* (New York,  
1943, vol. XI).

According to an account in *Young Bolshevik*, religion contradicts the "science" of communism:

The philosophy of Marxism-Leninism—the theoretical foundation of the Communist Party—is incompatible with religion. . . . The world outlook of the party is based on



scientific data, while religion contradicts science. As the Party bases its activity on a scientific foundation, it is bound to oppose religion.

—*Young Bolshevik*, No. 5–6, 1946, p. 58.

To replace religious beliefs, the Kremlin directed that the masses be educated in an “atheistic world outlook.”

In the educational work of the Party organizations a serious place must be assigned to the fight against religious beliefs and superstitions and to educating the masses in an atheistic world outlook.

—*Bolshevik*, July 1950, p. 53.

The young Communist, upon whom the Kremlin relies to carry out its nationalistic aims, fails in his “duties” if he believes in God:

If a Communist Youth believes in God and goes to church, he fails to fulfil his duties. This means that he has not yet rid himself of religious superstitions and has not become a fully conscious person (Communist).

—*Young Bolshevik*, No. 5–6, 1946, p. 56.

A young man or woman cannot be a Communist youth unless he or she is free of religious convictions.

—*Young Communist Truth*, October 18, 1947.

In their propaganda against religion, the Soviets said in 1949 that “religious survivals” were hindering the advancement of the Communist society.

Religious survivals play a very harmful role even in our country. They hinder the advancement of our society and its development along the path of Communism. They hinder believers from becoming conscious and active builders of a Communist society. . . Religion, whatever garb it may assume, is essentially hostile to Communism.

—*Teachers' Gazette*, November 26, 1949.

Radio Leningrad broadcast in 1950:

The struggle against the Gospel and Christian legend must be conducted ruthlessly and with all the means at the disposal of communism.

—Radio Leningrad, August 27, 1950.

Soviet leaders have extended their attack on religion to specific targets outside the areas they control; they attempt to undermine the religious beliefs of the rest of the world by accusing church leaders of helping to prepare “for a new world war”:

A particularly reactionary role is played by the Vatican, the head of the World Catholic Church. The Pope, together with the complex machinery of the Catholic church and the Catholic clergy, is a direct instrument of American imperialism in the struggle against democracy, Communism and the Soviet Union, and in preparations for a new world war.

—*Teachers' Gazette*, November 26, 1949.

The Kremlin warned the Soviet people that:

The full disappearance and dying out of religion will occur only when all the social causes which produced it are destroyed, i. e. the exploiting society will be destroyed, and a communist society established.

—*Narodnoe Obrazovanie* (Popular Education), April 1949, p. 18.

## FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

LIKE freedom of religion, freedom of the press is guaranteed by law to the Soviet peoples:

In conformity with the interests of the toilers and to the end of strengthening the socialist social order, citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed by law: (a) freedom of speech, (b) freedom of the press, (c) freedom of assembly and meetings, and (d) freedom of street parades and demonstrations. These civil rights are assured by granting to the toilers and



their organizations the use of printing establishments, stocks of paper, public buildings, streets, means of communication, and other material conditions essential for their realization.

—U.S.S.R. Constitution of 1936, Article 125.

This emphasis on “material conditions” is also conspicuous in a statement on the subject made by Stalin:

Freedom of the press for the proletariat is not an empty phrase in our country. There can be no freedom of the press without the best printing plants, without the best houses of the press, without open organizations of the working class, both small and large, and without the most ample freedom of assembly. Study carefully the living conditions in the U.S.S.R.; visit the workers’ districts, and you will understand that the best printing presses, the best houses of the press, entire paper factories necessary for the press, enormous palaces for assemblies, all that and many other things indispensable for the freedom of the working class press, are entirely at the disposal of the working class and of the laboring masses. That is what is called freedom of the press in our country for the working class.

—STALIN, “Interviews With Foreign Workers’ Delegations,” November 5, 1927 (*Leninism*, Moscow, 1934, vol. I, pp. 403–404).

There are, however, strict limitations on what the workers can do with the paper factories and printing presses so generously placed “at their disposal.” One of the most significant restrictions is described by Andrei Vyshinsky:

In our state, naturally there is and can be no place for freedom of speech, press, and so on for the foes of socialism. Every sort of attempt on their part to utilize to the detriment of the *state*—that is to say, to the detriment of *all the toilers*—these freedoms granted to the toilers must be classified as a counter-revolutionary crime. . . .

—VYSHINSKY, *Law of the Soviet State*, (Macmillan Co., New York, 1948, p. 617).

To minimize the possibility that the press might be used “to the detriment of the state,” Soviet leaders appoint the editorial boards of newspapers and “meticulously” select their staffs:

The Central Committee of the Communist Party appoints the editorial boards of the central press organs which work under its control and confirms the appointments of the editorial boards of the local Party organizations.

—*Charter of the All-Union Communist Party* (Moscow, 1943, p. 14).

One of the first obligations of the Party leadership is to select newspaper workers meticulously, especially [to make] a strict approach to the choice of candidate for editor.

—*Leningradskaya Pravda*, May 26, 1950.

As a further means of insuring that the “free” press loyally serves its masters, the Kremlin leaders insist on daily “reviews” of the newspapers:

The press review is one of the most flexible and efficient means of directing the newspapers. Reviews indicate to the editorial offices what to do and how to do it, and teach and train journalists. . . . The newspapers must be directed daily.

—“Important Means of Directing Newspapers,” *Partiinaya Zhizn*, No. 9, 1947.

The result of this day-to-day supervision is an enormous propaganda machine, highly effective for the purposes of the Government but hardly deserving of the title “free press.” Soviet figures indicate that there are 7,700 newspapers published in the U.S.S.R. with a total circulation of 33,500,000 copies. But since Government leaders permit no detour from their political line, these impressive figures actually add up to 33,500,000 mouthpieces for the Kremlin. Behind the Iron Curtain, there is only one line of thought:

The newspapers themselves are destined to play a leading role in the Communist training of the people, in the propagation



of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. "They must illuminate with the light of scientific socialism every manifestation confronting the toilers." (Stalin.)

—"Role of the Press in Economic and Political Life of Country Must Be Increased,"  
*Pravda*, October 18, 1946.

## EDUCATION

THE process of education and the entire educational apparatus in the Soviet Union have become subordinated to the immediate and future aims of the Kremlin leaders. No avenue of instruction is overlooked to inculcate the "Marxist-Leninist world outlook." Textbooks are revised to fit shifts in the Kremlin line, and the interpretation of events reflects the changing emphasis of government policy.

The following quotations show how the Kremlin uses education to further its nationalistic program:

It is in the school at the desk, in the first class, that the foundations for a Communist outlook are laid in future Soviet citizens. The country entrusts the school with its most treasured possessions—its children—and no one should be allowed to indulge in the slightest deviation from the principles of the Communist materialistic upbringing of the new generation.

—*Literary Gazette*, September 3, 1949.

The Soviet school cannot be satisfied to rear merely educated persons. Basing itself on the facts and deductions of progressive science, it should instill the ideology of Communism in the minds of the young generation, shape a Marxist-Leninist world outlook and inculcate the spirit of Soviet patriotism and Bolshevik ideas in them.

—"For Further Progress in Soviet Schools,"  
*Kultura i Zbizn* (Culture and Life),  
August 31, 1947.

Soviet students are taught to expect the "inevitable downfall" of the capitalist world and to prepare themselves for "the struggle for a new world" through communism:

It is important that pupils should clearly realize the doom of the capitalistic world, its inevitable downfall, that they should see on the other hand the great prospects of our socialist system, and actively get prepared when they leave school to be ready to take their place in life, in the struggle for a new world, for Communism.

—*Teachers' Gazette*, September 13, 1947.

The "spiritual figure" of Stalin is glorified by Kremlin propaganda as a model for students to follow in preparing for "their place in life":

What better means of influencing pupils than, for example, the following characteristic of the spiritual figure of Stalin given in the Short Biography: "Everyone knows the irresistible, shattering power of Stalin's logic, the crystal clearness of his intellect, his iron will, devotion to the Party, his modesty, artlessness, his solicitude for people and mercilessness to enemies of the people."

—*Teachers' Gazette*, March 17, 1947.

The Soviet leaders miss no opportunity to indoctrinate the very young. Children's toys bear the slogan: "Thank you, Comrade Stalin, for my joyous childhood."

## LOVE AND MARRIAGE

IN addition to religion and education, other aspects of personal life have been invaded by officialdom, as evidenced by these bits of advice given to residents of peripheral areas of Soviet control:

We are convinced that it would not be against, but rather for, the improvement of peaceful family relations if you would succeed in enrolling your wife in our Party. . . . Those party members who intend to get married in the near



future are advised and urged to connect their courtship with propagating our party and its principles to those they have chosen.

—Memorandum sent to male members of the Communist Party in East Germany.

When choosing a life-mate, the Communist youth should look first for correct political thoughts, and only afterward for education, temperament, health, and good looks. True love is somber, intellectual, and definitely revolutionary.

—“Problems of Love and Marriage,” official pamphlet of the Chinese Communist Party.

## LABOR

ACCORDING to *Moscow Bolshevik*, the Soviet Union offers its citizens “extensive rights,” including the “guarantee” of the “right to work”:

In our country there exists for all the workers, the full freedom of criticism of the work of any organization or undertaking. The Soviet Union guarantees to all its citizens extensive rights. The most important of these is the right to work . . . a guarantee which it is impossible for any capitalist country to give.

—“Soviet Order—Most Democratic in World,” *Moskovski Bolshevik*, November 22, 1945.

Let us look at some of the ways in which the Soviet authorities “guarantee” the “right to work”—and punish those who choose not to take advantage of the privilege of working where and how the State specifies.

Government technical schools producing semiskilled labor in the Soviet Union train more than a million young people between the ages of 14 and 18 each year. The law provides:

All those who graduate from the Trade Schools, Railroad Schools, and Industrial Training Schools are to be considered as mobilized and are obliged to work four years continuously

in state enterprises, as directed by the Central Labor Reserve Administration under the Council of People’s Commissars of the U.S.S.R.

—*Izvestia*, October 3, 1940.

If a Soviet youngster leaves a trade school against orders, he is punished by imprisonment in a labor colony. The Criminal Code instructs:

Voluntary departure from the school or systematics and violations of school discipline by students of trade and railroad schools and factory and plant training schools entails expulsion from school and imprisonment, pursuant to trial, in a labor colony for one year.

—Criminal Code of the R.S.F.S.R., Moscow, 1948.

Thousands of nationals of other countries have been forced to work as slave laborers for the Kremlin. Soviet workers must abide by strict labor regulations issued by the Kremlin masters controlling Soviet industries. If a Russian worker fails to comply with government orders, he goes to prison or to a forced labor camp. He can be transferred from one job to another at the Government’s bidding but cannot quit his job without the express consent of the authorities. Yet *Pravda* complained in 1947:

Some workers in Soviet institutions do not understand the great heights to which the Soviet state has raised them.

—*Pravda*, September 3, 1947.

Those “great heights” were made clear by a law of 1940 which is still in effect. The Soviet State had:

Complete authority for the forced transfer of engineers, designers, technicians, foremen, draftsmen, bookkeepers, economists, accountants, and planning personnel, as well as skilled factory workers, from one enterprise or institution to another, regardless of the territorial location of the institution or enterprise.

—*Izvestia*, October 20, 1940.



Despite the propaganda issued by the Kremlin to the contrary, the U.S.S.R. probably has the harshest labor discipline of all the industrial countries of the world. Soviet law prescribes:

That for absence from work with[out] important reasons the workers and employees of state, cooperative, and public enterprises and institutions shall be brought to trial and according to the sentence of the court be punished by being compelled to work at their normal place of employment for a period not to exceed six months and during the period of compulsory labor 24 percent of their wages shall be withheld.

—Criminal Code of the R.S.F.S.R., Moscow, 1948.

## TRAVEL

SOVIET civil codes and the Constitution provide that the individual has the right to move freely and to settle in any part of the country; actually, every citizen who wishes to travel or to change his residence from one city to another must comply with complicated regulations. He must obtain permission of the police before leaving home and must report to the police when he reaches his destination.

The law prescribes:

All citizens of the U.S.S.R. who have reached 16 years of age and are living in a locality under the passport system are obliged to have a passport. Persons living in places where the passport system is not in effect but leaving for other parts of the U.S.S.R. must get a passport at the police headquarters of the place where they live.

—*Kazakhstan Pravda*, Tashkent, June 26, 1948.

Furthermore, the regulations continue:

Citizens arriving in a new locality for permanent or temporary residence must register at police headquarters not later than 24 hours after their arrival. When registering

at the place where one is to stay it is necessary to present one's passport (and for military personnel also a military pass) to the person responsible for registration—the apartment house manager, the home owner, or the commandant.

—*Ibid.*

The Soviet citizen must approach the police for permission to take a trip:

All persons going to other localities for a period of more than a month and a half (excepting official business trips, vacations for health camp groups, or trips to summer houses) must sign out of their former place of residence. Citizens who do not have a notation in their passport made by the police showing that they have received permission to leave their former residence cannot be registered at a new place of residence. Managers of apartment houses, home owners, and commandants must register all new arrivals within the first 24 hours and sign out all those going to other localities for a period of more than a month and a half.

—*Ibid.*

The limitation of movement in the Soviet State also applies to the fields of labor and education, as this quotation indicates:

Heads of enterprises, institutions, and training centers have the right to accept workers, employees, and students only if they have in their possession passports and residence approval for the given locality. It is necessary to confirm the notation in the passport showing release from the former place of work, to confirm the notation showing that the person has signed out from the former place of residence, and to note in the passport the date of acceptance for work or registration for study. . . . For failure to observe the above listed obligations of the passport system for citizens, apartment house managers, home owners, and heads of enterprises and institutions are subject to an administrative fine of 100 rubles, and for a repetition of the violation to criminal prosecution.

—*Ibid.*



In most countries, an individual is free to accept a concept as truth or not. Not so in the Soviet Union, or the countries it controls. This quotation of Soviet President Kalinin speaks for itself:

The idea that the truth remains the truth is admissible in a philosophical club, but in the Party, the decisions of the congress are obligatory also upon those who doubt the correctness of a decision. . . . Our Party is strong through the fact that the decisions of the majority are obligatory upon all not only in form, but in substance.

—KALININ, "Speech to XIV Congress, Russian Communist Party," 1925.

A masterpiece of double-talk on the subject of individual freedom in the U.S.S.R. was contributed by Andrei Vyshinsky during a speech on the draft declaration of human rights at the U.N. General Assembly. The former Public Prosecutor declaimed with righteous indignation:

Certain speakers . . . are composing fictions that in the U.S.S.R. there is allegedly a desire to subordinate the human personality to the state. In the U.S.S.R. the relations between the state and the human personality are characterized by harmony. Their interests coincide.

—*Pravda*, December 14, 1948.

## . . . ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

COUNTRIES outside the Iron Curtain have learned to accept double-talk as a feature of Soviet policy. The Kremlin is experienced at using words to conceal rather than to reveal its true intentions. Just as its spoken words are often contrary to its real thoughts, its dealings with other nations are shot through with deceit.

"Sincere diplomacy," Stalin once said, "is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

The Soviets have spent several decades planning their intricate program. They are on record, by word and action. Yet, asked directly about Soviet aims, Stalin said the outside world "misunderstood" Soviet intentions. In an interview with Roy Howard of the Scripps-Howard newspapers in 1936, he denied that the Soviets planned to bring about a world revolution.

Mr. Howard: "May there not be an element of danger in the genuine fear existent in what you term capitalist countries of an intent on the part of the Soviet Union to force its political theories on other nations?"

Premier Stalin: "There is no justification whatever for such fears. If you think that the Soviet people want to change the face of surrounding states, and by forcible means at that, you are entirely mistaken. Of course, the Soviet people would like to see the face of surrounding states changed but that is the business of the surrounding states. I fail to see what danger the surrounding states can perceive in the ideas of Soviet people if these states are really firmly sitting in the saddle."

Mr. Howard: "Does this, your statement, mean that the Soviet Union has to any degree abandoned its plans and intentions for bringing about a world revolution?"

Premier Stalin: "We never had such plans and intentions."

Mr. Howard: "You appreciate, no doubt, Mr. Stalin, that much of the world has long entertained a different impression."

Premier Stalin: "This is the product of a misunderstanding."

—*New York Times*, March 5, 1936.

In line with Stalin's statements, Molotov in 1939 told the fifth session of the Supreme Soviet that the U.S.S.R. stood for "scrupulous observance" of pacts and "noninterference" in the affairs of other states—specifically the Baltic countries, with which Russia had recently signed mutual assistance pacts:

The special character of these mutual assistance pacts in no way implies any interference on the part of the Soviet Union



in the affairs of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania, as some organs of the foreign press charge. On the contrary all these pacts of mutual assistance strictly stipulate the inviolability of the sovereignty of the signatory states and the principle of non-interference in each other's affairs. . . . We stand for the scrupulous and punctilious observance of the pacts on the basis of complete reciprocity and we declare that all the non-sensical talk about the Sovietization of the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs.

—*Pravda*, November 1, 1939.

One month previously the country of Lithuania, in whose affairs the Soviets professed to have no interest whatsoever, had been earmarked as part of the "sphere of influence of the U.S.S.R." in a secret treaty with Nazi Germany negotiated by Molotov himself. The Soviets renounced claim to a small strip of the country; this was to go to Germany.

The Secret Supplementary Protocol signed on August 23, 1939, shall be amended in item 1 to the effect that the territory of Lithuanian state falls to the sphere of influence of the U.S.S.R., while, on the other hand, the province of Lublin and parts of the province of Warsaw fall to the sphere of influence of Germany. . . . As soon as the Government of the U.S.S.R. shall take special measures on Lithuanian territory to protect its interests, the present German-Lithuanian border, for the purpose of a natural and simple boundary delineation, shall be rectified in such a way that the Lithuanian territory situated to the southwest of the line marked on the attached map should fall to Germany.

—Captured archives of the German Foreign Office: Secret Supplementary Protocol  
Signed in Moscow September 28, 1939.

A few weeks after signing "assistance pacts" with the three Baltic states, the Soviets offered similar "assistance" to Finland. Finland declined the offer on November 26, 1939. On November 30, Soviet troops attacked.

Six months later, on June 15, 1940, while world attention was focused on the collapse of the French Army, the Soviets invaded Lithuania. Its President and other government officials fled the country. The next day Latvia and Estonia yielded to a Soviet ultimatum and allowed Russian troops to occupy their countries.

The face of the surrounding states was changing rapidly.

After the German invasion broke up the short-lived Nazi-Soviet alliance, Stalin depicted the U.S.S.R. as the liberator of the peoples "under Hitler's tyranny." He declared the Soviets' aim of "setting them free to rule in their own lands as they desire."

The story of how the Soviets "liberated" the victims of Hitler is now history. Yet *Izvestia* reported in 1945:

In the early months of the war, Stalin said, "We have not and cannot have such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavs and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are awaiting our aid. Our aim consists in assisting these peoples in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny and then setting them free to rule in their own lands as they desire." . . . In all countries liberated from fascist tyranny the Red Army, in accordance with the statements of the Soviet Government is setting an example of respect for the honor and dignity of liberated peoples, for their state system, culture, national traditions, and the great monuments of their past. The Red Army in no case prevents the liberated peoples from living their lives on their lands as they see fit.

—"The U.S.S.R.—Mighty Bulwark of Universal Peace and Progress," *Izvestia*, July 11, 1945.

Stalin, in 1942, spoke of the "clear and noble" intentions of the Soviets:

We are waging a just war for our country and our freedom. It is not our aim to seize foreign lands or to subjugate foreign people. Our aim is clear and noble. We want to free our Soviet land of the German-Fascist scoundrels. We want to free our Ukrainian, Moldavian, Byelorussian, Lithuanian,



Latvian, Estonian and Karelian brothers from the outrage and violence to which they are being subjected by the German-Fascist scoundrels.

—STALIN Order of the Day No. 130, May 1, 1942, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1946, p. 59).

Six years later, after stretching a "helping hand" to the peoples of Europe, the U.S.S.R. was commended by *Izvestia* on February 22, 1948, for standing "on guard for peace throughout the world." While performing this "historic liberating mission," however, the Soviets intensified their program and propaganda to communize the world. Most of the small countries of central Europe, which Soviet troops "liberated" during the war fell before the onslaught of communism and disappeared behind the Iron Curtain as satellites of the U.S.S.R.

The article in *Izvestia* read:

The Soviet Army not only cleared the German-Fascist invaders from sacred Soviet soil but stretched out a brotherly, helping hand to the peoples of Europe languishing in Fascist slavery. The European peoples have to thank the Soviet Army for their liberation. The victorious offensive launched by the Soviet troops had a decisive influence on the liberation struggle of the people's democratic forces throughout the countries enslaved by Fascism. The Soviet Army saved European civilization from the Fascist barbarians, honourably and worthily performed their historic liberating mission. . . . By crushing the main hotbeds of Fascist-German aggression in the West and imperialist Japan in the East, the Soviet Army won the recognition and respect of the peoples of all countries. . . . As always, the Soviet Army stands on guard to protect the peaceful labour and tranquillity of the peoples. Always, it stands on guard for peace throughout the world.

—"On Guard for World Peace," *Izvestia*, February 22, 1948.

The Soviet leaders talked of peace. Their propaganda was filled with references to the democratic concepts of peace and freedom and world security. When 51 nations gathered in San Francisco in 1945 to form a world organization to build for peace and security among nations, the U.S.S.R. was represented. To all outward appearances, the U.S.S.R. was willing to work for peace with other countries.

The U.S.S.R. had everything to gain. As in the other nations which had been the battlegrounds of World War II, some of its key production areas were broken by war. Its industries were dislocated. Although its huge land armies were still in existence, it lacked the strength it needed for war. Hence its interest in a period of peace and the revival of its standard tactics of zigzag and retreat. Later the other members of the United Nations were to see demonstrations of obstructionism, but for the time being all was sweetness and light.

An American newspaperman—Mr. Gilmore of the Associated Press—asked Stalin in 1946: "What importance do you attribute to U.N.O. as a means of preserving international peace?"

This was Stalin's answer:

I attribute great importance to U.N.O. since it is a serious instrument for preservation of peace and international security. Strength of this international organization consists in the fact that it is based on principle of equal rights of states and not on principle of domination over others. If it can preserve in future the principle of equal rights, then undoubtedly it will play great positive role in cause of maintenance of universal peace and security.

—*Pravda*, March 23, 1946.

The same attitude of optimism was attributed to the Soviet peoples:

The masses know that peace is possible only on the basis of cooperation among the existing states. . . . The Soviet Union is fighting to have the United Nations as effective as possible.

—"Contemporary Bourgeois Sociology," *Bolshevik*, No. 22 of November 1946, p. 51.



Behind the "zigzag" of the brave words was the reality of Soviet intentions. For certain ears, the United Nations could be praised as an instrument to help prevent "domination" of one country over another, but later in the same year *Bolshevik* saw little hope for peace and harmony among nations on the basis of the United Nations:

It is hardly possible, however, that the contemporary grave-diggers of sovereignty are so naive as to believe in earnest that peace and harmony on earth can be obtained by the creation of an international parliament.

—"International Law at Its Present Stage,"  
*Bolshevik*, No. 21 of November 1946,  
p. 28.

Molotov's speech on the 30th anniversary of the October revolution in Russia stated boldly the theme of capitalist decay and the "inevitability" of world revolution:

Capitalism has become a brake on human progress, and the continuation of the reckless policy of imperialism, which has already brought about two world wars, constitutes the major danger to the peace loving nations. The great October Socialist Revolution has opened the eyes of the nations to the fact that the age of capitalism is drawing to a close and that reliable roads have been opened to universal peace and the great progress of nations. The feverish efforts of imperialists, under whom the ground is giving way, will not save capitalism from its approaching doom. We are living in an age in which all roads leads to Communism.

—*Pravda*, November 7, 1947.

The U.S.S.R. has proclaimed its willingness to find peaceful solutions to political, social, and economic problems through the United Nations, but its deeds have not matched its words. The record of U.S.S.R. "cooperation" makes a significant total:

(1) The U.S.S.R. has obstructed and refused to cooperate with the efforts of the majority to find equitable solutions to problems

of international concern. The U.S.S.R. is credited with 47 vetoes out of a total of 48 registered in the United Nations.

(2) The U.S.S.R. has disregarded its responsibility as a major power to support the work of the various U.N. agencies entrusted with the task of bettering the social and economic conditions of the world.

The U.S.S.R. is a member of only three out of eleven specialized agencies in being in the United Nations—the International Telecommunication Union, the Universal Postal Union, and the World Meteorological Organization. The U.S.S.R. withdrew from the World Health Organization on the grounds of excessive expense and dissatisfaction with the agency's program. In withdrawing, it did not wait to present its objections to the WHO assembly in June 1949, when the budget and program were to be discussed.

(3) The U.S.S.R. has continued its obstructionism within the United Nations through the tactics of its representatives, particularly in vilifying the action of the United Nations and its supporters with respect to aggression in Korea.



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN  
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS LIBRARIES

DATE RETURNED

--	--